DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in response to the amendment and the Terminal

Disclaimer filed on 5 April 2011 and based on the decision that mailing of the

Office Action mailed on 4/22/2011 was improperly mailed Final. Below is a

replica of the office action mailed on 4/22/2011 with additional comments and

responses to some requests that were previously missed.

This office action is made Non-Final.

2.   Claim 74 has been amended.

3.   The rejection of claims 47-51, 55-60 under 35 USC 112, second

paragraph, has been withdrawn by reasons disclosed by the Examiner below.

The double patenting rejection of Claims 47, 52, 53, 55, 60, 62, and 67 has been

withdrawn as necessitated by the approval of the Terminal Disclaimer filed.

4.   Claims 47-59, 62-80 are pending. Claims 47, 52, 53, 55, 62, and 67 are

independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

5.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 2/10/2010 and

11/19/2010 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the

information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 47, 50, 52-59, 62-70, 73, 77-79 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamkin et al. (hereinafter Lamkin), U.S. Publication No. US 2002/0088011 A1, filed 7/2/2001, provisional filing 7/7/2000 (cited via Applicant's IDS) in further view of Otsuka et al (20030044171, filed 8/24/2001) in further view of Kanazawa et al (US Patent 6580870, filed 11/27/1998)

As per independent claim 47, Lamkin et al discloses an method disclosing a DVD (a storage medium) containing AV data, and including HTML documents in directories to reproduce said AV data in an interactive mode (a DVD video content and HTML content with extra information regarding said video encoded on said DVD, playable via computer connected to the Internet) (Abstract; Paragraph 0035, 0039, 0063, 0066, 0068, 0174, 0224). Furthermore, Lamkin discloses different embodiments that disclose a form of a startup document. In one embodiment, Lamkin teaches a common HTML page (index.htm) in a directory named "common" (a form of startup document) (Lamkin paragraph [0075]). Furthermore, Lamkin discloses various other embodiments in which a HTML page is shipped with a DVD (a form of startup document) that links to a web site on the Internet or other supplemental information provided from the HTML data stored on the DVD (linking is a form of information about other markup document) (Lamkin, Paragraph 0035, 0066-0070) Thus, Lamkin

discloses a user can select a link to another web site through the start up

document that to be interpreted by the presentation engine (display interface)

However, Lamkin fails to specifically disclose the medium itself comprises

a plurality of markup documents. However, Otsuka et al discloses allowing a user

to browse HTML documents stored in the local optical disc. Otsuka discloses an

AV interface displaying a HTML document which includes a menu coded in

HTML (HTML menu) that includes links to other website documents. FIG 2B

discloses a embodiment of an HTML file showing selectable links to other

documents. This HTML document is a form of a start-up document since it is

executed upon the disc player is initialized when it's turned on.   From the HTML

menu presented in a form of an HTML document, the user can select/retrieve

other web document stored on the local optical disc. (Paragraph 0003, 0021,

0025, 0027) Since Otsuka discusses a first document being displayed, and the

user can use first document to retrieve a second document wherein both

documents are stored on the disc, Otsuka discloses plurality of documents stored

on the medium. (Paragraph 0003, 0021, 0025, 0027) It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to

have modified Lamkin in further view of Otsuka since it would have provided the

benefit of allowing users to retrieve additional information about a topic quickly

without the need of a network or Internet.

Furthermore, Lamkin discloses identifying parental level values (Page 11,

Right Column, "ParentalLevelSelect(n)" command that allows a parental level to

be selected) wherein the commands control the playback and navigation

mechanisms of the DVD (Paragraph 0131); however, Lamkin and Otsuka fail to

specifically disclose documents corresponding to different parent levels and a

document specifying which one of the documents corresponds to different

parental level to be interpreted depending on the parental level. However,

Kanazawa discloses the ability to restrict the access of Web display related

information (web page) based on a parental level wherein the access information

is defined on the basis of parental information related to a parental function in

system attribute information set in the system. Kanazawa discloses analyzing the

content of the web page and only selecting and retrieving web page/web page

content that coincides with the set parental level. Furthermore, Kanazawa

discloses "when the related information that coincides with the parental level set

in the system is not present, it will not be reproduced on the screen. In other

words, when the parental level of the related information is, for example, the

adult oriented maximum level "8," if the parental level set in the reproducing

system is "7" or lower, the related information will not be reproduced even if the

user requests. This prevents the related information irrelevant to the attributes of

the system (in this case, the related information that does not coincide with the

parental level) from being accessed and enables the related information

conforming with the attributes of the system to be always acquired." Therefore,

only the contents to be reproduced (displayed) are limited on the basis of the set

parental levels. In other words, only content (web pages) that matches the

parental level requirements will be accessed while the other content will be

restricted and inaccessible. Thus, only the access information is defined on the

basis of the set parent level resulting in link information coincides with the set

parent level being selectable. (Col 5, lines 16-17, 47-50, 55-63; Col 5, line 64 –

Col 6, line 13; Col 9, lines 15-47; Col 10 lines 45-48)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Applicant's invention to have modified Lamkin and Otsuka with Kanazawa since

it would have provided the benefit of enabling the user to acquire the best related

information while conforming with the attributes of the system.

As per dependent claims 50, Claims 50 recites similar limitations as in

Claim 47 and is similarly rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Lamkin et al

discloses link information identifying locations of documents (Paragraph 0066,

0068, 0070, Claim 15: discloses links to other documents/sites). Based on the

rejection of Claim 47 and the rationale incorporated, Otsuka discloses link

information according to different parental levels. In addition, Kanawaza

discloses "when the related information that coincides with the parental level set

in the system is not present, it will not be reproduced on the screen. In other

words, when the parental level of the related information is, for example, the

adult oriented maximum level "8," if the parental level set in the reproducing

system is "7" or lower, the related information will not be reproduced even if the

user requests. This prevents the related information irrelevant to the attributes of

the system (in this case, the related information that does not coincide with the

parental level) from being accessed and enables the related information

conforming with the attributes of the system to be always acquired." (Col 5, lines

16-17, 47-50, 55-63; Col 5, line 64 – Col 6, line 13; Col 9, lines 15-47; Col 10

lines 45-48)   In other words, if the user has a higher allowed parental level then

the page's set parental level, then the user is able to view the page and/or

certain/all content. If the user has a lower allowed parent level, then the page

and/or certain/all content is blocked.

As per independent claim 52, Lamkin et al discloses an method disclosing

a DVD (a storage medium) containing AV data, and including HTML documents

in directories to reproduce said AV data in an interactive mode (a DVD video

content and HTML content with extra information regarding said video encoded

on said DVD, playable via computer connected to the Internet) (Abstract;

Paragraph 0035, 0039, 0063, 0066, 0068, 0174, 0224). Furthermore, Lamkin

discloses different embodiments that disclose a form of a startup document. In

one embodiment, Lamkin teaches a common HTML page (index.htm) in a

directory named "common" (Lamkin paragraph [0075]). Furthermore, Lamkin

discloses various other embodiments in which a HTML page is shipped with a

DVD (a form of startup document) that links to a web site on the Internet or other

supplemental information provided from the HTML data stored on the DVD

(linking is a form of information about other markup document) (Lamkin,

Paragraph 0035, 0066-0070) Thus, Lamkin discloses a user can select a link to

another web site through the start up document that to be interpreted by the

presentation engine (display interface)   Furthermore, Lamkin teaches interactive

content displayed on an interactive screen (clickable scenes in a displayed HTML

Web page) on a display device that displays the HTML document and DVD

content (paragraph 0066, 0103-0104); FIG 1 item 138, FIG 2) wherein Lamkin

discloses embedding AV content with the HTML document (Paragraph 0117,

0121-0124) In addition, Lamkin discloses the common directory (a form of "root"

directory) contains an index page and device specific subdirectories. Also,

Lamkin discloses ROM content is stored in subdirectories and top-level

directories containing subdirectories. For example, top-level Sony directory may

have a PS2, PS3, and CE (platform) directories wherein each platform directory

contains an ITX.htm file (startup). Lamkin explicitly discloses the creation of PS2

and PS3 directories under the Sony directory. Therefore, the PS2 & PS3

directories are subdirectories of the Sony directory. Thus, Lamkin teaches

various directories (i.e. directories and subdirectories) storing both DVD content

and HTML content accordingly (Lamkin paragraph 0035, 0080, 0089-0090, 0099)

However, Lamkin fails to specifically disclose the medium itself comprises

a plurality of markup documents. However, Otsuka et al discloses allowing a user

to browse HTML documents stored in the local optical disc. Otsuka discloses an

AV interface displaying a HTML document which includes a menu coded in

HTML (HTML menu) that includes links to other website documents. FIG 2B

discloses a embodiment of an HTML file showing selectable links to other

documents. This HTML document is a form of a start-up document since it is

executed upon the disc player is initialized when it's turned on.   From the HTML

menu presented in a form of an HTML document, the user can select/retrieve

other web document stored on the local optical disc. (Paragraph 0003, 0021,

0025, 0027) Since Otsuka discusses a first document being displayed, and the

user can use first document to retrieve a second document wherein both

documents are stored on the disc, Otsuka discloses plurality of documents stored

on the medium. (Paragraph 0003, 0021, 0025, 0027) It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to

have modified Lamkin in further view of Otsuka since it would have provided the

benefit of allowing users to retrieve additional information about a topic quickly

without the need of a network or Internet.

       Furthermore, Lamkin discloses identifying parental level values (Page 11,

Right Column, "ParentalLevelSelect(n)" command that allows a parental level to

be selected) wherein the commands control the playback and navigation

mechanisms of the DVD (Paragraph 0131); however, Lamkin and Otsuka fails to

specifically disclose documents corresponding to different parent levels and a

document specifying which one of the documents corresponds to different

parental level to be interpreted depending on the parent level. However,

Kanazawa discloses the ability to restrict the access of Web display related

information (web page) based on a parental level wherein the access information

is defined on the basis of parental information related to a parental function in

system attribute information set in the system. Kanazawa discloses analyzing the

content of the web page and only selecting and retrieving web page/web page

content that coincides with the set parental level. Furthermore, Kanazawa

discloses "when the related information that coincides with the parental level set

in the system is not present, it will not be reproduced on the screen. In other

words, when the parental level of the related information is, for example, the

adult oriented maximum level "8," if the parental level set in the reproducing

system is "7" or lower, the related information will not be reproduced even if the

user requests. This prevents the related information irrelevant to the attributes of

the system (in this case, the related information that does not coincide with the

parental level) from being accessed and enables the related information

conforming with the attributes of the system to be always acquired." Therefore,

only the contents to be reproduced (displayed) are limited on the basis of the set

parental levels. In other words, only content (web pages) that matches the

parental level requirements will be accessed while the other content will be

restricted and inaccessible. Thus, only the access information is defined on the

basis of the set parent level resulting in link information coincides with the set

parent level being selectable. (Col 5, lines 16-17, 47-50, 55-63; Col 5, line 64 –

Col 6, line 13; Col 9, lines 15-47; Col 10 lines 45-48)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Applicant's invention to have modified Lamkin and Otsuka with Kanazawa since

it would have provided the benefit of enabling the user to acquire the best related

information while conforming with the attributes of the system.

As per independent claim 53, Claim 53 recites similar limitations as in

Claims 47, 50 and 52 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 54, it is implicitly known in HTML for multiple links,

wherein each link corresponds to document, each link has it owns <a href="">

tag that corresponds to a document.

As per independent claim 55, Claim 55 recites similar limitations as in Claims 47 and 52 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 56, Claim 56 recites similar limitations as in Claim 55, and is similarly rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Lamkin does not specifically teach displaying information according to a "set parental level". However, based on the rejection of Claim 52, 55, and the rationale incorporated, Kanazawa discloses the ability to restrict the access of Web display related information (web page/web page content) based on a parental level wherein the access information is defined on the basis of parental information related to a parental function in system attribute information set in the system. Kanazawa discloses analyzing the content of the web page and only selecting and retrieving web page/web page content that coincides with the set parental level. Furthermore, Kanazawa discloses "when the related information that coincides with the parental level set in the system is not present, it will not be reproduced on the screen. In other words, when the parental level of the related information is, for example, the adult oriented maximum level "8," if the parental level set in the reproducing system is "7" or lower, the related information will not be reproduced even if the user requests. This prevents the related information irrelevant to the attributes of the system (in this case, the related information that does not coincide with the parental level) from being accessed and enables the related information conforming with the attributes of the system to be always acquired." Therefore, only the contents to be reproduced (displayed) are limited on the basis of the set level parental levels. In other words, only content (web

pages) that matches the parental level requirements will be accessed while the

other content will be restricted and inaccessible. Thus, only the access

information is defined on the basis of the set parent level resulting in link

information coincides with the set parent level being selectable. (Col 5, lines 16-

17, 47-50, 55-63; Col 5, line 64 – Col 6, line 13; Col 9, lines 15-47; Col 10 lines

45-48)

As per dependent claim 57, Lamkin discloses a stylesheet (i.e. CSS)

(Paragraph 0124)

As per dependent claim 58, Lampkin does not specifically teach displaying

information (elements of a mark-up document allotted to class values) according

to a "set parental level" (class values of elements based on display information).

However, based on the rejection of Claim 52, 55, and the rationale incorporated,

Kanawaza discloses blocking/restricting web content based upon a numerical

(value) control (8 parental level values, 1-8) wherein these set predetermined

values determine which elements, content and other information of the Web page

to be displayed, and teaches specifying which content/web pages a user is

allowed to access, based on the set parental level.   (Col 5, lines 16-17, 47-50,

55-63; Col 5, line 64 – Col 6, line 13; Col 9, lines 15-47; Col 10 lines 45-48)

As per dependent claim 59, Lamkin discloses a stylesheet (i.e. CSS)

(Paragraph 0124)

As per independent claim 62, Claim 62 recites similar limitations as in

Claims 47, 55 and 58 and is similarly rejected under rationale. Furthermore,

Lamkin discloses an optical pickup to radiate laser beams on the data storage

medium to read the mark-up documents and the AV data from the data storage

medium (Abstract; Paragraph 0035, 0039, 0063, 0066, 0068, 0174, 0224:

Discloses a DVD (a storage medium) containing AV data, and including HTML

documents in directories to reproduce said AV data in an interactive mode (a

DVD video content and HTML content with extra information regarding said video

encoded on said DVD, playable via computer connected to the Internet) Also,

Lamkin discloses the use information being read from the disc using a laser

beam. (Paragraph 0015) Furthermore, Lamkin discloses blending the HTML

page and video (Paragraph 0153-0154)

Lamkin discloses identifying parental level values (Page 11, Right

Column, "ParentalLevelSelect(n)" command); however, fail to specifically

disclose a presentation engine identifying a predetermined value of an element of

the mark-up document and determining whether to display the element

depending on the predetermined value, parental level and display rule

information. However, based on the rejection of Claim 52, 55, and the rationale

incorporated, Kanazawa discloses the ability to restrict the access of Web display

related information (web page/web page content) based on a parental level

wherein the access information is defined on the basis of parental information

related to a parental function in system attribute information set in the system.

Kanazawa discloses analyzing the content of the web page and only selecting

and retrieving web page/web page content that coincides with the set parental

level. This is based upon a numerical (value) control (8 parental level values, 1-8)

wherein these set predetermined values determine which elements, content and

other information of the Web page to be displayed, and teaches specifying which content/web pages a user is allowed to access, based on the set parental level. Furthermore, Kanazawa discloses "when the related information that coincides with the parental level set in the system is not present, it will not be reproduced on the screen. In other words, when the parental level of the related information is, for example, the adult oriented maximum level "8," if the parental level set in the reproducing system is "7" or lower, the related information will not be reproduced even if the user requests. This prevents the related information irrelevant to the attributes of the system (in this case, the related information that does not coincide with the parental level) from being accessed and enables the related information conforming with the attributes of the system to be always acquired." Therefore, only the contents to be reproduced (displayed) are limited on the basis of the set level parental levels. In other words, only content (web pages) that matches the parental level requirements will be accessed while the other content will be restricted and inaccessible. Thus, only the access information is defined on the basis of the set parent level resulting in link information coincides with the set parent level being selectable. (Col 5, lines 16-17, 47-50, 55-63; Col 5, line 64 – Col 6, line 13; Col 9, lines 15-47; Col 10 lines 45-48)

        As per dependent claims 63-64, Lamkin teaches a stylesheet (CSS) (Paragraph 0124)

As per dependent claim 65, Claim 65 recites similar limitations as in Claims 58, 62 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 66, based on the rejection of Claim 62, and the rationale incorporated, Kanazawa discloses "when the related information that coincides with the parental level set in the system is not present, it will not be reproduced on the screen. In other words, when the parental level of the related information is, for example, the adult oriented maximum level "8," if the parental level set in the reproducing system is "7" or lower, the related information will not be reproduced even if the user requests. This prevents the related information irrelevant to the attributes of the system (in this case, the related information that does not coincide with the parental level) from being accessed and enables the related information conforming with the attributes of the system to be always acquired." Therefore, only the contents to be reproduced (displayed) are limited on the basis of the set level parental levels. In other words, only content (web pages) that matches the parental level requirements will be accessed while the other content will be restricted and inaccessible. Thus, only the access information is defined on the basis of the set parent level resulting in link information coincides with the set parent level being selectable. (Col 5, lines 16-17, 47-50, 55-63; Col 5, line 64 – Col 6, line 13; Col 9, lines 15-47; Col 10 lines 45-48)

As per claims 67-68, Claim 67-68 recite similar limitations as in Claims 47, 55, and 62 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 69, Lamkin discloses plug-ins (Paragraph 0220)

As per dependent claim 70, Lamkin discloses retrieving data and the mark-up documents through a network. (FIG 1, 2, Paragraph 0068)

As per dependent claim 73, Claim 73 recites similar limitations as in Claim 67 and is similarly rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Lamkin discloses an API (Lamkin paragraph [0051])

As per dependent claim 77, Claim 77 recites similar limitations as in Claim 52 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claims 78-79, Claim 78-79 recites similar limitations as in Claim 55, 57-59, 60-61 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

8.   Claims 48-49, 51, 71-72, 74-76, 80 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamkin et al in further view of Otsuka et al in further view of Kanazawa et al in view of Berstis et al. (US Patent 6,510,458 filed 7/15/1999)

As per dependent claim 48, Claim 48 recites similar limitations as in Claim 47 and is similarly rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Lamkin et al discloses link information identifying locations of documents (Paragraph 0066, 0068, 0070, Claim 15: discloses links to other documents/sites). Kanawaza discloses link information according to different parental levels. (Col 5, lines 16-17, 47-50, 55-63; Col 5, line 64 – Col 6, line 13; Col 9, lines 15-47; Col 10 lines 45-48) However, Lamkin, Otsuka and Kanawaza do not specifically teach meta-information according to different parental levels. However, Berstis teaches HTML meta-information associated with parental levels (Berstis column 10 lines

10-19; col 12, lines 13-15; col 14, lines 60-67 -insert an extra header into the

document before the contents of the document; col 15, lines 4-6, 12-25 –

embedding in the document). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the invention to apply Berstis to Lamkin, Otsuka and

Kanawza, providing the benefit of meta-data to more accurately describe

parental data and selecting which HTML page (via links) to view based on

parental levels.

As per dependent claims 49, Claims 49 recites similar limitations as in

Claim 47 & 48 and are similarly rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Lamkin et

al discloses link information identifying locations of documents (Paragraph 0066,

0068, 0070, Claim 15: discloses links to other documents/sites). In addition,

based on the rejection of Claim 47 and the rationale incorporated, Kanawaza

discloses "when the related information that coincides with the parental level set

in the system is not present, it will not be reproduced on the screen. In other

words, when the parental level of the related information is, for example, the

adult oriented maximum level "8," if the parental level set in the reproducing

system is "7" or lower, the related information will not be reproduced even if the

user requests. This prevents the related information irrelevant to the attributes of

the system (in this case, the related information that does not coincide with the

parental level) from being accessed and enables the related information

conforming with the attributes of the system to be always acquired." In other

words, if the user has a higher allowed parental level then the page's set parental

level, then the user is able to view the page and/or certain/all content. If the user

has a lower allowed parent level, then the page and/or certain/all content is blocked.

As per dependent claim 51, Lamkin discloses DVD video data and markup documents written in HTML (FIG 2; Paragraph 0035,0080). However, Lamkin does not specifically teach parental levels meeting DVD standards or ratings. However, based on the rejection of Claim 48 and the rationale incorporated, Berstis teaches RSAC, a ratings service for computer games (typically distributed on CD or DVD, as well as MPAA for movies (typically on DVDs) (Berstis column 13 lines 15-20, 40-46).

As per dependent claim 71, 72, Lamkin teaches DVD data and DVD-video and DVD-audio standards (FIG 2; Paragraph 0080) and setting parental levels (Page 11, Right Column, "ParentalLevelSelect(n)"). However, based on the rejection of Claim 48 and the rationale incorporated, Berstis teaches RSAC, a ratings service for computer games (typically distributed on CD or DVD, as well as MPAA for movies (typically on DVDs) (Berstis column 13 lines 15-20, 40-46

As per dependent claim 74, Claim 74 recites similar limitations as in Claim 48 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 75, Claim 75 recites similar limitations as in Claim 47, 49 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 76, Claim 76 recites similar limitations as in Claim 73 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 80, Claim 80 recites similar limitations as in Claim 51 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

Terminal Disclaimer

9.   The terminal disclaimer filed on 4/5/2011 disclaiming the terminal portion

of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the

expiration date of Pat. # 7,493,552 has been reviewed and is accepted. The

terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Response to Arguments

10.   (Added 6/15/11) It is noted that the Finality of the Office Action mailed on

4/22/2011 has been withdrawn by persuasiveness of Applicant's arguments in

regards to Claims 67-70 presented to Examiner Faber and SPE Cesar Paula

during the phone conversation occurring between 6/12/11-6/15/11.

11. It is noted that the Amendment After Final filed on March 22, 2010 has been

entered.

12.   After further review of Claims 47-51, 55-60 reject under 112, second

paragraph, the 112 rejection was not withdrawn in light of Applicant's remarks

filed on 4/5/2011; however, it was determined it does not have an indefinite

issue. Therefore, the claim limitations comply with the 112, second paragraph

requirements.

13.   It is noted that Applicant filed an IDS on 2/13/2004 which discloses the

Application Serial 10/612415 within 10/777900. 10612415 is the Serial Number

(#) for Patent 7493552. Therefore, the Office already recognizes the prosecution

history of 10612415 and the fact it was patented and assigned Patent #7493552

which is reflected within 10777900 by the filing of the IDS. Thus, 7493552 is

already acknowledged within 10/777900 and there is no need to recite it in a

Form 892. If Applicant disagrees with this reasoning, Applicant may file a Form

1449 disclosing Patent #7493552.

14. (Added 6/15/11) Its noted that the IDS filed on 2/13/2004 and 11/19/2010

both contain the correct listings of the Kelts reference. In the event that the

Applicant believes the Kelts reference listed is 2/13/2004, the filing of the

"correct" listing in the IDS filed on 11/19/2004 would overwrite the previous entry

disclosed in the IDS filed on 2/13/2004. Therefore, no need for the Examiner to

mail out another copy of the IDS filed on 2/13/2004.

15.   Applicant's arguments filed 4/5/2011 have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive.

16.   On pages 19-23, in regards of Claim 47, Applicant argues that Lamkin,

Ostuka and Kanazawa individually fail to teach the limitations and they cannot be

combined to teach the claim. Applicant especially states that cited prior art does

not teach the following limitations "a plurality of mark-up documents

corresponding to different parental levels; and a start-up mark-up document

specifying which one of the plurality of mark-up documents corresponding to

different parental levels is to be interpreted by the presentation engine of the

apparatus depending on a parental level set in the apparatus." Furthermore,

Applicant argues that Ostuka does not discloses using a first document retrieving

a second document nor does Kanazawa discloses disclose documents

corresponding to different parental levels and a document specifying which one

of the documents corresponds to different parental levels to be interpreted

depending on the parent level. However, the Examiner disagrees.

   In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually,

one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the

rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642

F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231

USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

   In response to applicant's argument that there is no teaching, suggestion,

or motivation to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that

obviousness may be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the

prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching,

suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in

the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re*

Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d

347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992), and *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex,*

Inc., 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007).

Therefore, based on the claim language of the claim limitations, the claim language does explicitly state how the start-up markup document specifies which one of other documents that corresponds to a certain parental level to be interpreted. Therefore, as long as the art specifies in anyway of indicating another document (corresponding to a parental level) to be interpreted using a startup markup document, then the art read upon the claim. Therefore, based on the broadest reasonable interpretation, Lamkin et al discloses a method disclosing a DVD (a storage medium) containing AV data, and including HTML documents in directories to reproduce said AV data in an interactive mode (a DVD video content and HTML content with extra information regarding said video encoded on said DVD, playable via computer connected to the Internet) (Abstract; Paragraph 0035, 0039, 0063, 0066, 0068, 0174, 0224). Furthermore, Lamkin discloses different embodiments that disclose a form of a startup document. In one embodiment, Lamkin teaches a common HTML page (index.htm) in a directory named "common" (a form of startup document) (Lamkin paragraph [0075]). Furthermore, Lamkin discloses various other embodiments in which a HTML page is shipped with a DVD (a form of startup document) that links to a web site on the Internet or other supplemental information provided from the HTML data stored on the DVD (linking is a form of information about other markup document) (Lamkin, Paragraph 0035, 0066-0070) Thus, Lamkin discloses a user can select a link to another web site through the start up document that to be interpreted by the presentation engine (display interface)

However, Lamkin fails to specifically disclose the medium itself comprises a plurality of markup documents. However, Otsuka et al discloses allowing a user to browse HTML documents stored in the local optical disc. Otsuka discloses an AV interface displaying a HTML document which includes a menu coded in HTML (HTML menu) that includes links to other website documents. FIG 2B discloses a embodiment of an HTML file showing selectable links to other documents. This HTML document is a form of a start-up document since it is executed upon the disc player is initialized when it's turned on.   From the HTML menu presented in a form of an HTML document, the user can select/retrieve other web document stored on the local optical disc. (Paragraph 0003, 0021, 0025, 0027) Therefore, a first document can be used to access a second document on the disc. Since Otsuka discusses a first document being displayed, and the user can use first document to retrieve a second document wherein both documents are stored on the disc, Otsuka discloses plurality of documents stored on the medium. (Paragraph 0003, 0021, 0025, 0027) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified Lamkin in further view of Otsuka since it would have provided the benefit of allowing users to retrieve additional information about a topic quickly without the need of a network or Internet.

Furthermore, Lamkin discloses identifying parental level values (Page 11, Right Column, "ParentalLevelSelect(n)" command that allows a parental level to be selected. Selecting is a form of identifying) wherein the commands control the playback and navigation mechanisms of the DVD (Paragraph 0131); however,

Lamkin and Otsuka fail to specifically disclose documents corresponding to

different parental levels and a document specifying which one of the documents

corresponds to different parental level to be interpreted depending on the

parental level. However, Kanazawa discloses the ability to restrict the access of

Web display related information (web page) based on a parental level wherein

the access information is defined on the basis of parental information related to a

parental function in system attribute information set in the system. Kanazawa

discloses analyzing the content of the web page and only selecting and retrieving

web page/web page content that coincides with the set parental level.

Furthermore, Kanazawa discloses "when the related information that coincides

with the parental level set in the system is not present, it will not be reproduced

on the screen. In other words, when the parental level of the related information

is, for example, the adult oriented maximum level "8," if the parental level set in

the reproducing system is "7" or lower, the related information will not be

reproduced even if the user requests. This prevents the related information

irrelevant to the attributes of the system (in this case, the related information that

does not coincide with the parental level) from being accessed and enables the

related information conforming with the attributes of the system to be always

acquired." Therefore, only the contents to be reproduced (displayed) are limited

on the basis of the set parental levels. In other words, only content (web pages)

that matches the parental level requirements will be accessed while the other

content will be restricted and inaccessible. Thus, only the access information is

defined on the basis of the set parent level resulting in link information coincides

with the set parent level being selectable. (Col 5, lines 16-17, 47-50, 55-63; Col

5, line 64 – Col 6, line 13; Col 9, lines 15-47; Col 10 lines 45-48)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Applicant's invention to have modified Lamkin and Otsuka with Kanazawa since

it would have provided the benefit of enabling the user to acquire the best related

information while conforming with the attributes of the system.

Thus, Lamkin, Ostuka and Kanazawa disclose the limitations.

16.   On pages, 23-24, in regards to Claim 52, Applicant argues similar

arguments as when arguing in regards to Claim 47. In response, Examiner refers

the Applicant to Examiner's Claim's 47 response on disclosing how the prior art

teaches the limitations. Furthermore, Applicant argues that the cited prior art

does not teach sub-directories corresponding to a plurality of different parental

levels, but teach user device platforms. However, the Examiner disagrees.

Lamkin discloses the common directory (a form of "root" directory)

contains an index page and device specific subdirectories. Also, Lamkin

discloses ROM content is stored in subdirectories and top-level directories

containing subdirectories. For example, top-level Sony directory may have a

PS2, PS3, and CE (platform) directories wherein each platform directory contains

an ITX.htm file (startup). Lamkin explicitly discloses the creation of PS2 and PS3

directories under the Sony directory. Therefore, the PS2 & PS3 directories are

subdirectories of the Sony directory. Thus, Lamkin teaches various directories

(i.e. directories and subdirectories) storing both DVD content and HTML content

accordingly (Lamkin paragraph 0035, 0080, 0089-0090, 0099). Therefore, in

combination of Lamkin, Ostuka, and Kanazawa, the combination teaches the

limitations

17.   On pages, 24-25, in regards to Claim 53, Applicant argues similar

arguments as when arguing in regards to Claim 52. In response, Examiner refers

the Applicant to Examiner's Claim's 52 response on disclosing how the prior art

teaches the limitations. Furthermore, Applicant argues that the cited prior art

does not teach a start-up mark-up document comprising link information

identifying locations of the plurality of mark-up documents corresponding to the

plurality of different parental levels. However, the Examiner disagrees.

Lamkin discloses various other embodiments in which a HTML page is

shipped with a DVD (a form of startup document) that links to a web site on the

Internet or other supplemental information provided from the HTML data stored

on the DVD (linking is a form of information about other markup document)

(Lamkin, Paragraph 0035, 0066-0070) Thus, Lamkin discloses a user can select

a link to another web site through the start up document that to be interpreted by

the presentation engine (display interface) Thus, Lamkin discloses link

information. Furthermore, Kanazawa discloses the ability to restrict the access of

Web display related information (web page) based on a parental level wherein

the access information is defined on the basis of parental information related to a

parental function in system attribute information set in the system. Kanazawa

discloses analyzing the content of the web page and only selecting and retrieving

web page/web page content that coincides with the set parental level.

Furthermore, Kanazawa discloses "when the related information that coincides

with the parental level set in the system is not present, it will not be reproduced

on the screen. In other words, when the parental level of the related information

is, for example, the adult oriented maximum level "8," if the parental level set in

the reproducing system is "7" or lower, the related information will not be

reproduced even if the user requests. This prevents the related information

irrelevant to the attributes of the system (in this case, the related information that

does not coincide with the parental level) from being accessed and enables the

related information conforming with the attributes of the system to be always

acquired." Therefore, only the contents to be reproduced (displayed) are limited

on the basis of the set parental levels. In other words, only content (web pages)

that matches the parental level requirements will be accessed while the other

content will be restricted and inaccessible. Thus, only the access information is

defined on the basis of the set parent level resulting in link information coincides

with the set parent level being selectable and designing to select link information

on the basis of the parental information. (Col 5, lines 16-17, 47-50, 55-63; Col 5,

line 64 – Col 6, line 13; Col 9, lines 15-47; Col 10 lines 45-48)

18.   On pages 25-26, in regards to Claim 55, Applicant is arguing that Claim 55

does not contain similar limitations as in Claim 47 since Claim 55 discloses

display rule information for a plurality of different parental levels specifying

whether to display the interactive contents associated with the AV data

depending on a parental level set in the apparatus. . Furthermore, Applicant

argues the cited prior art does not teach the limitation. However, the Examiner

disagrees.

Claim 47 recites specifying which one of the plurality of markup

documents corresponding to different parental levels to be interpreted by the

presentation engine. In addition, Paragraph 0047 of Applicant's specification

discloses the presentation engine reproduce the AV data in the interactive mode.

Another claim limitation in Claim 47 discloses that reproducing the AV data in an

interactive mode is done by displaying the AV data and interactive contents.

Thus, the presentation engine is used to displaying. Furthermore, the written

claim language of the limitation "specifying… interpreted by the presentation

engine" is disclosing a form of display rule information since its specifying which

document to be interpreted by the presentation engine, a form of specifying

whether or not to display the document, wherein the document contains

interactive AV data (disclosed earlier to the claim). Thus the claim limitation is

specifying whether or not to display the document containing AV data/interactive

contents which is similar to Claim 55's limitation. Nonetheless, Kanazawa

discloses the ability to restrict the access of Web display related information (web

page/web page content) based on a parental level wherein the access

information is defined on the basis of parental information related to a parental

function in system attribute information set in the system. Kanazawa discloses

analyzing the content of the web page and only selecting and retrieving web

page/web page content that coincides with the set parental level. Furthermore,

Kanazawa discloses "when the related information that coincides with the

parental level set in the system is not present, it will not be reproduced on the

screen. In other words, when the parental level of the related information is, for

example, the adult oriented maximum level "8," if the parental level set in the

reproducing system is "7" or lower, the related information will not be reproduced

even if the user requests. This prevents the related information irrelevant to the

attributes of the system (in this case, the related information that does not

coincide with the parental level) from being accessed and enables the related

information conforming with the attributes of the system to be always acquired."

Therefore, only the contents to be reproduced (displayed) are limited on the

basis of the set level parental levels. In other words, only content (web pages)

that matches the parental level requirements will be accessed while the other

content will be restricted and inaccessible. Thus, only the access information is

defined on the basis of the set parent level resulting in link information coincides

with the set parent level being selectable. (Col 5, lines 16-17, 47-50, 55-63; Col

5, line 64 – Col 6, line 13; Col 9, lines 15-47; Col 10 lines 45-48) Thus, the cited

prior art teaches the limitations.

19.   On page 26-27, in regards to Claim 58, Applicant argues that the

Kanawaza does not teach the limitation because Kanawaza does not explicitly

mention the word "class" or "class attribute". However, the Examiner disagrees.

        While Kanawaza does not use the word "class", the claim language fails to

specifically disclose what a class attribute of the element actually is. Therefore,

the broadest reasonable interpretation is used. Based on the rejection of Claim

52, 55, and the rationale incorporated, Kanawaza discloses blocking/restricting

web content based upon a numerical (value) control (8 parental level values, 1-8)

wherein these set predetermined values determine which elements, content and

other information of the Web page to be displayed, and teaches specifying which

content/web pages a user is allowed to access, based on the set parental level.

(Col 5, lines 16-17, 47-50, 55-63; Col 5, line 64 – Col 6, line 13; Col 9, lines 15-

47; Col 10 lines 45-48)

19.   On page 27-60, in regards to Claims 62 & 65, Applicant argues that the

cited prior art fails to specifically teach the claim limitations of Claim 62 and 65.

Applicant argues that Claim 62 does not recite the same language or features as

Claim 47 and 55. However, the Examiner disagrees.

While Claim 62 and 65 does exactly use the same exact wording as

Claims 47, 55, and in addition, 58, the scope of the subject matter is similar by

using similar terminology. Therefore, they are similar. Based on the scope of the

subject matter of the claim language, Lamkin discloses an optical pickup to

radiate laser beams on the data storage medium to read the mark-up documents

and the AV data from the data storage medium (Abstract; Paragraph 0035, 0039,

0063, 0066, 0068, 0174, 0224: Discloses a DVD (a storage medium) containing

AV data, and including HTML documents in directories to reproduce said AV data

in an interactive mode (a DVD video content and HTML content with extra

information regarding said video encoded on said DVD, playable via computer

connected to the Internet) Also, Lamkin discloses the use information being read

from the disc using a laser beam. (Paragraph 0015) Furthermore, Lamkin

discloses blending the HTML page and video (Paragraph 0153-0154)

Lamkin discloses identifying parental level values (Page 11, Right

Column, "ParentalLevelSelect(n)" command that allows a parental level to be

selected. Selecting is a form of identifying); however, fail to specifically disclose a

presentation engine identifying a predetermined value of an element of the mark-

up document and determining whether to display the element depending on the

predetermined value, parental level and display rule information. However, based

on the rejection of Claim 52, 55, and the rationale incorporated, Kanazawa

discloses the ability to restrict the access of Web display related information (web

page/web page content) based on a parental level wherein the access

information is defined on the basis of parental information related to a parental

function in system attribute information set in the system. Kanazawa discloses

analyzing the content of the web page and only selecting and retrieving web

page/web page content that coincides with the set parental level. This is based

upon a numerical (value) control (8 parental level values, 1-8) wherein these set

predetermined values determine which elements, content and other information

of the Web page to be displayed, and teaches specifying which content/web

pages a user is allowed to access, based on the set parental level.

Furthermore, Kanazawa discloses "when the related information that coincides

with the parental level set in the system is not present, it will not be reproduced

on the screen. In other words, when the parental level of the related information

is, for example, the adult oriented maximum level "8," if the parental level set in

the reproducing system is "7" or lower, the related information will not be

reproduced even if the user requests. This prevents the related information

irrelevant to the attributes of the system (in this case, the related information that

does not coincide with the parental level) from being accessed and enables the

related information conforming with the attributes of the system to be always

acquired." Therefore, only the contents to be reproduced (displayed) are limited

on the basis of the set level parental levels. In other words, only content (web

pages) that matches the parental level requirements will be accessed while the

other content will be restricted and inaccessible. Thus, only the access

information is defined on the basis of the set parent level resulting in link

information coincides with the set parent level being selectable. (Col 5, lines 16-

17, 47-50, 55-63; Col 5, line 64 – Col 6, line 13; Col 9, lines 15-47; Col 10 lines

45-48)

20.   On pages 32-34, in regards to Claim 48 and 74, Applicant argues that

Bertis et al alone does not disclose a start-up document comprising meta-

information indicating a parental level of the mark up documents. However, the

Examiner disagrees.

        In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually,

one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the

rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642

F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231

USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

It is noted that Claim 48 recites similar limitations as in Claim 47 and is

similarly rejected under rationale. Lamkin, Otsuka and Kanawaza do not

specifically teach meta-information according to different parental levels.

However, Berstis teaches HTML meta-information associated with parental levels

(Berstis column 10 lines 10-19; col 12, lines 13-15; col 13, lines 14-58; col 14,

lines 60-67 -insert an extra header into the document before the contents of the

document; col 15, lines 4-6, 12-25 – embedding in the document).Thus, Bertis

discloses embedding labels into documents disclosing that document's (parental)

rating. The labels are considered metadata. (Col 12, line 14) It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply

Berstis to Lamkin, Otsuka and Kanawza, providing the benefit of meta-data to

more accurately describe parental data and selecting which HTML page (via

links) to view based on parental levels.

Therefore, Bertis teaches the limitations.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to David Faber whose telephone number is 571-

272-2751. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday, and every

other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cesar Paula, can be reached on 571-272-4128. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/David Faber/
Examiner, Art Unit 2177

| | /CESAR B PAULA/ |
| | Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2177 |